

 Nottinghamshire County Council	Report to Rights of Way Committee
	11 September 2013
	Agenda Item:
REPORT OF CORPORATE DIRECTOR (ENVIRONMENT AND RESOURCES)	
APPLICATION TO ADD A BRIDLEWAY TO THE DEFINITIVE MAP AND STATEMENT IN THE PARISHES OF KING'S CLIPSTONE, EDWINSTOWE AND RUFFORD	

Purpose of Report

1. To consider an application made on 3rd April 2012 by Mr C Thompson on behalf of the Nottinghamshire Area Ramblers Association. The effect of this application if accepted and confirmed, would be to record a public bridleway approximately 3250 metres long on an existing road/track between the B6030, Kings Clipstone and Deerdale Lane, Rufford. A map of the area is shown as Appendix A, with the route under consideration marked between points A-B-C. A series of photographs taken along the route are shown in Appendix B1-12.

The Law

2. The application was made under the provisions of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. Under Section 53(2)(b) of the Act the Surveying Authority (Nottinghamshire County Council) has a duty to keep the Definitive Map and Statement under continuous review and to make such modifications to the Definitive Map and Statement that appear to be requisite in consequence of the occurrence of events described in Section 53(3)(c)(i); namely "the discovery by the authority of evidence which (when considered with all other relevant evidence available to them) shows: that a right of way which is not shown in the map and statement subsists or is reasonably alleged to subsist". The case of R v Secretary of State for the Environment ex parte Bagshaw and Norton (1994) has clarified the law in respect of the meaning of 'subsists' (Test A) and 'reasonably alleged to subsist' (Test B);
 - 'Test A' requires that the claimed right of way subsists i.e. clear evidence in respect of the claim and **no credible evidence to the contrary**.
 - 'Test B' requires that it is reasonable to allege a right of way subsists i.e. even if the evidence is finely balanced, but there is **no incontrovertible evidence that the claimed route could not subsist**, then the test is met and an Order should be made.

Information and advice

3. The northern end of the route between Point A and Culloden is laid with tarmac, while the remainder is laid with stone. A plan indicating ownership of the route is shown as

Appendix C which shows that the majority of the route is on land owned by the Forestry Commission with a short section belonging to Blooms Gorse Farm. The northern end of the route is on unregistered land.

4. The claimed route A-B-C serves as the sole vehicular access to a small number of properties and businesses. Access is also required for forestry vehicles. Part of the route A-B is currently promoted as a Forestry Commission trail for walking and cycling.
5. In June 2011 the Rights of Way Committee considered a report based on evidence discovered by officers (while researching an Application next to the Center Parcs Holiday Village) which recommended that the same route be recorded as a Restricted Byway. A copy of the 2011 Report (without appendices) is shown as Appendix D. After considering the matter, Committee resolved not to authorise the making of a modification order. This same route has now been formally applied for by the Ramblers Association and, as further new evidence has been discovered, the Authority is required by law to make a decision on whether to make a Definitive Map Modification Order, hence this report.

Historic Documentary Evidence

6. An Application to modify the definitive map can be based on historic evidence (such as maps, official records etc.) or on evidence of actual use by members of the public, or on a combination of historic and actual use. This particular Application is based on historic evidence alone.
7. As well as all of the evidence previously considered by Committee in 2011, four additional documents have been examined by officers in respect of the current Application namely;
 - Map of Clipstone 1824
 - Clipstone Estate Map 1885
 - Highway Authority 'Handover Map' 1929
 - Clipstone Estate Sale Plan 1945

The 1824 Tithe Map and the 1885 Estate Map both constitute 'new evidence' for the purposes of the Application, as they have not previously been considered by the Authority. The 1929 Handover Map does not contain any 'new evidence' as such, but is useful in terms of shedding light on how the status of the route was regarded at that time. The 1945 Clipstone Estate sale plan can be disregarded as it contains no relevant information and does not cover the area of the claimed route. Accordingly, all relevant documents are described below in chronological order;

8. Map of Clipstone by William Senior 1630 (Appendix E)

The Senior Map depicts a road or track which corresponds with section A-B of the claimed route. This route appears to be a main route leading to/from Clipstone and is coloured ochre in the same manner as other roads/tracks shown on the map.
9. Map of Clipstone by George Ingman 1766 (Appendix F)

The Ingman Map depicts a road or track which corresponds with section A-B of the claimed route. Again, the route appears to be a main route leading to/from Clipstone.

10. Map of Nottinghamshire by John Chapman 1774 (Appendix G)

Chapman's map does not depict the claimed route. There are two possibilities for this; it was either due to an error, or it was because the route was thought to be a private road and therefore was intentionally omitted (the purpose of the map was to show only the known public carriage roads and bridleways at that time).

11. The Edwinstowe Inclosure Award map 1821 (Appendix H)

Part of Section A-B of the claimed route is shown and annotated as the 'Clipston Bilsthorpe and Southwell Road'. This description corresponds with the 'road' depicted in the Senior and Ingman maps. As a statutory document the information contained in the inclosure award is regarded as particularly strong evidence for the public status of the route. The adjacent parishes of Clipstone and Rufford were not subject to the inclosure process and therefore no equivalent record exists for those areas.

12. Map of Clipstone belonging to the Duke of Portland 1824 (Appendix I1-2)

This map depicts a road which corresponds with section A-B of the claimed route. The map is part of a private collection currently held within the Welbeck Estate Archive. As the copy submitted with the application is not sufficiently legible, the original map has been inspected at first hand to verify its contents. Although the original map does not contain a title or key, it appears to be accurately drawn and identifies acreages within each parcel of land. Section A-B of the claimed route is clearly depicted by parallel lines and is coloured ochre. It is notable that other public roads are also depicted in this way. Immediately south of point A the map depicts (in red ink) a realigned bend in the road which between Clipstone and Ollerton. This bend corresponds with the current position of the B6030 near point A. Another road (now physically disappeared) leading from the bend and forming a 'dog-leg' with the claimed route is labelled 'Bilsthorpe Road 33ft'. The depiction of this route is suggestive of a public through road between Clipstone and Bilsthorpe via the claimed route.

13. Map of Nottinghamshire by Thomas Ellis 1831 (Appendix J)

This map covers the area of the whole of the claimed route and according to the key contained in the map, the majority of the claimed route is depicted as an 'Open Road' i.e. a minor public road which was not hedged or fenced on either side. It is notable that the map allows for routes to be annotated 'B.R.' for bridle roads and 'P.R.' for private roads. Clearly the A-B-C route was not considered to fall into either of these categories. The alignment of the route shown on the Ellis map generally corresponds with the claimed route, although it does show the southern end of the route near point C on a different alignment to the one being claimed.

14. Map of Nottinghamshire by C and J Greenwood 1831 (Appendix K)

According to the key contained in the map, the majority of the claimed route is depicted as a 'Cross Road'. Historically the term 'cross road' was used for minor roads which ran 'cross country' rather than the modern meaning for a place where roads meet. This definition again suggests that the route was regarded to be a minor public road. The southern end of the route near point C is also depicted in a similar manner to the Ellis Map and is therefore on a different alignment to the route being claimed.

15. A map entitled 'Twenty Miles Round Mansfield' by George Sanderson 1835 (Appendix L)

This map is far more detailed than the Ellis and Greenwood maps and also depicts the claimed route as a 'Cross Road'. Sanderson's map depicts a 'dog leg' in the route immediately south of point A (i.e. similar to that shown in the 1824 Clipstone Tithe Award)

which may suggest that the earlier 'straight through' route was less well used by this time. The alignment at the southern end now corresponds with the claimed route.

16. Ordnance Survey 2" map 1840 (Appendix M)

This map depicts a road or track which corresponds with the claimed route A-B-C. It also indicates that the Sanderson 'dog leg' alignment co-existed with a straight through route at that time. Although this map confirms that the route physically existed at the time the survey was carried out, no information is provided as to the status of the route.

17. Clipstone Tithe Award Map 1844 (Appendix N)

The tithe map depicts a road/track which runs between points A-B of the claimed route albeit via the 'dog leg' alignment shown on the Sanderson Map. Again, this may suggest that the 'straight through' route was less well used at the time of the survey. The route is labelled 'From Bilsthorpe' which suggests that it was regarded as a through road and therefore is more likely than not to have been a public highway. Other public highways are also depicted in this same manner.

18. Archive documents from the Rufford Highway Surveyors 1882-3 (Appendix O)

Prior to 1894 the local parish was responsible for the repair of minor public roads. Accordingly, the surviving Highway Surveyors records include a list of 'Public Roads repaired by the Parish'. The list refers to one particular public road of 95 chains in length (1911 metres) leading from the 'Nottingham Road (at Deerdale) to Mansfield' and heading 'towards Clipston'. In terms of its length and location, this road corresponds with section B-C of the claimed route.

19. Plan of Rufford Liberty 1885 (Appendix P)

This plan identifies land belonging to the Saville Estate in Rufford and encompasses section B-C of the claimed route. The status of public and private roads within the Estate are each depicted in accordance with a key which comprises; 'private park roads', 'public roads repaired by the Estate', 'public highways' and 'main roads'. Whilst route B-C is shown, it is not annotated at all which therefore suggests that the claimed route B-C was not considered by the Estate to be a road of any form (either public or private).

20. Duke of Portland Estate Plan 1885 revised 1910 (Appendix Q1-2)

This plan from the Welbeck Estate archives shows certain land belonging to the Duke of Portland. Section A-B of the claimed route is depicted as being the 'public road...from Bilsthorpe'.

21. Finance Act 1910 (Appendix R)

Documents prepared under the provisions of the Finance Act 1910 were also examined. The purpose of the Finance Act was to levy a tax based on the estimated value of land. In establishing this, the Inland Revenue allowed deductions for public rights of way on any land being evaluated. Evidence relating to the existence of public rights of way in Finance Act documents arises in one of two ways:

- Explicit reference to a public right of way within documents forming part of the valuation process, or
- The exclusion of a road or track from land being assessed (depicted on the map itself).

No fully complete maps have been found in relation to the A-B part of the claimed route; however section B-C is shown as being privately owned land (rather than being excluded as is usually the case for public roads). This shows that the respective landowners did not claim any deductions for public rights of way.

22. Highway Authority 'Handover Maps' 1929 (Appendix S)

These maps were produced following Local Government re-organisation in 1929 and are a record of the highways maintainable at the public expense which were transferred from the responsibility of the Rural District Council (Southwell RDC) to the County Council. Although the map indicates a track along the line of the claimed route, it is not recorded as being a publicly maintained highway at that time. This does not prove that highway rights did not exist, but simply shows that it was not understood at that time to be maintainable at the public expense.

23. Parish Schedules 1954

These documents were prepared by the Parish Councils between 1952-54 for submission to County Councils for the identification of public rights of way to be entered onto the first Definitive Map (under the provisions of the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949). In this case, no rights of way were identified in respect of the route being claimed.

24. Documents also submitted with the application, but of little evidential value consisted of the Encyclopaedia Britannica map of Nottinghamshire (1876), the Edward Weller map of Nottinghamshire (1898), the Encyclopaedia Britannica map of Nottinghamshire (1902), an Ordnance Survey 6" map (1916) and the 1927 Guilford map of Nottinghamshire. These (mostly small scale) maps all show the route but do not give any indication of its status.

25. A copy of a letter from the Welbeck Estate to the County Council (dated 1956) which relates to Definitive Map issues of the time was also submitted in evidence. The letter states that there has been no 'interference' by the Estate with public access over the 'open moorlands'. However, the letter does not contain any specific information of relevance to the claimed route.

26. Nottinghamshire Quarter Session Records 1658-1974

Quarter Session Court records often include references to extinguishments and diversions of public highways; however no records for any extinguishment or diversion have been found which relate to the route in question.

27. On balance the documentary evidence dating from 1630 suggests that the route was once a minor public road between Clipstone and Bilsthorpe. The evidence from the Edwinstowe Inclosure Award (1821), The Clipstone Tithe Map (1824) and the Rufford Highway Surveyors (1882-3) are particularly strong in this respect. Although it appears that the route was regarded as public as late as 1885, once the responsibility for maintaining minor public roads was transferred to Southwell Rural District Council in 1894, any knowledge of the route's public status appears to have been lost.

Status of the Route

28. Notwithstanding the application being for a bridleway, the evidence appears to show the existence of a full vehicular carriageway. Prior to 2006, the decision to be made would have been whether to make a Modification Order to record a byway open to all traffic. However, any rights for mechanically propelled vehicles on the claimed route were extinguished on 2nd May 2006 by Section 67 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006. The effect of this is that the highest rights which could remain are for non-mechanically propelled vehicles. Accordingly the 2006 Act introduced the classification of 'Restricted Byway' which comprises footpath and bridleway rights plus rights for non-mechanically propelled vehicles (i.e. horse and carriage etc).

Consultation

29. In May 2012 consultation was carried out with all known owners, occupiers and businesses affected by the current claim. Letters were also sent to district councils, parish councils, rights of way user groups and public utility companies. It is noted that when this matter was previously considered by Committee (June 2011) 8 objections were received; however on this occasion only two objections/letters of concern have been received (i.e. the Adrenalin Jungle and the Forestry Commission). All responses, either in support or objecting to the current proposal are summarised below (officer's response in italics).

30. Mr Hutchinson, manager of 'The Adrenalin Jungle', an outdoor activities centre which is accessed along the southern part of the claimed route responded as follows;

- Access is required for business employees and customers. Any changes affecting this use would be significant.
- It is hoped that any steps to prevent illegal use by motor vehicles will not affect vehicles entering with the permission of the Forestry Commission.
- Would the operation of existing barriers be left in the control of the landowners/tenants or would the number of barriers be increased and control of these barriers altered?

No private vehicular rights would be lost or removed if the claimed right of way were to be confirmed. However the barrier at point C, if closed, would constitute an obstruction on a public right of way and therefore it would need to remain unlocked at all times. It is noted that a similar barrier exists just off the claimed route turning into the entrance of the Adrenalin Jungle. This barrier would not be affected by the proposal and therefore could be closed or locked by the landowner.

31. The Clerk of Clipstone Parish Council responded as follows;

- The Parish Council agreed to support the application...as it was felt this route has benefitted, and should continue to benefit the residents of Clipstone.
- The County Council is urged to designate this route as a bridleway, as opposed to a restricted byway to avoid the potential problems use by motor vehicles could cause residents and other users of the path.

The wishes of the Parish Council in respect of a bridleway designation are noted, however the County Council must base any decision to record a public right of way on the evidence available as to the status, be that footpath, bridleway or restricted byway, rather than any desire or preference.

32. The Nottinghamshire Footpath Preservation Society responded as follows;

- Our Committee considered the proposal to register a bridleway in Sherwood Pines Forest Park. We strongly support the proposal as it adds a very useful addition to the Rights of Way Network in the area. We would much prefer a bridleway rather than a restricted byway, as it would make it much easier to install furniture to prevent unauthorised use by motorised vehicles and off-roaders.

The wishes of the Society in respect of a bridleway designation are noted; however the County Council must base any decision to record a public right of way on the evidence of status available, be that at footpath, bridleway or restricted byway status rather than any desire or preference.

33. The Forestry Commission responded as follows;

- The Commission has dedicated Sherwood Pines as open access land under the provisions of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000.

The general public has a right to 'enter and remain' on designated access land by virtue of the Act. This right must be exercised reasonably and with respect to other rights which exist and in no way affects any pre-existing highway rights.

- The Commission welcomes and encourages cyclists in Sherwood Pines and provides surfaced and way marked trails which include part of the claimed route.

The section of the claimed route between Culloden and point 'B' is currently sign posted as a cycling trail.

- The Commission is experienced in managing a range of different users including walkers, cyclists, motor rallies and forestry operations.
- In the Commission's experience, unless barriers are in place, motorbikes, quad bikes and 4x4 vehicles will illegally use the route. What structures would the County Council consider installing to prevent the illegal access?

In practice there is no type of barrier which would prevent access by motorbikes and quad bikes while allowing access for non-mechanically propelled vehicles. Structures do exist which give access to horse drawn carriages but prevent access for cars, vans and lorries etc, however if subsequently considering such matters, the legitimate rights of access by private motor vehicles will need to be given careful consideration. It should be noted that under section 34 of the Road Traffic Act 1988, it is a criminal offence to drive a mechanically propelled vehicle on any footpath, bridleway or restricted byway without lawful authority. Should such a situation arise, the police have powers to immediately stop such use and to seize vehicles.

- Increased levels of crime have been experienced in forests with similar public rights of way including fly tipping, illegal access by motorised vehicles, damage to the forest, increased risk of burglary, theft or vandalism on nearby properties and

increased anti-social behaviour issues. The Commission would like to discuss the making of a gating order under the Highways Act 1980 (Section 129) if applicable to Crown Land.

A gating order could only be implemented if the route were already accepted as a public right of way. The Forestry Commission would need to supply evidence that the existence of the right of way is facilitating crime or anti-social behaviour. The criteria for making a gating order could present some technical problems in respect of private access i.e. a gating order may not be made to restrict a public right of way on a highway which is the only or principal means of access to a property (which it is for Preston Lodge, Culloden Blooms Gorse Farm, The Adrenalin Jungle). There is also a need to identify a convenient alternative route, which in this case, does not appear to be a possibility.

- A restricted byway would require the route to be wide enough to allow horse drawn non-mechanically propelled vehicles. The Commission requests confirmation of the width of the proposed route.

If an order were made, the width of the route would be established in accordance with the historic width. An approximate estimate of the possible width of the route at this stage would be around 4 metres, though this could be subject to variation following detailed analysis of the historic width.

- The Commission would wish to record all existing gates as limitations on the Definitive Map.

Four locations along the claimed route (two at Blooms Gorse Farm, one point adjacent to the Culloden entrance and another at point 'C') appear to have been gated at least since the 1880s and therefore if the route were to be confirmed as a public right of way, these gates could remain in situ (but should remain unlocked to allow public access). Unfortunately, the existing barrier at point 'A' (Appendix B2), the boulders near Culloden (Appendix B3) and the barrier near point 'B' (Appendix B6) would need to be removed (or left open) as there is no evidence of any historic limitations at these points.

- We are advised that all pre-existing private rights of access would continue if the route were to be confirmed as a public right of way.

If a public right of way were to be confirmed, any pre-existing private rights of access would continue as before.

- What duty of care does Nottinghamshire County Council consider it has under the Highways Act 1980 (Section 66) or otherwise to ensure the safety of users if the route were confirmed as a public right of way?

Section 66 of the Highways Act 1980 relates to the duties and powers of highway authorities to provide footways or other 'safety' measures such as walls, guard-rails and fences on highways maintainable at public expense. If a right of way were confirmed, such measures would not appear to be appropriate in this situation. It should also be noted that much of the route is already available to the public under open access provisions and on Forestry Commission walking/cycling trails. Should a situation arise whereby public use was found to be unsafe, the County Council would explore any practical or legal solutions to address this.

- From a lay person's perspective, some of the historic evidence is ambiguous and some is against a public right of way. A conclusion that a Modification Order should be made is subject to an unreasonable degree of doubt in this case.

*As referred to in paragraph 2, the test as to whether the Council should make an Order is set out in R v SSE ex parte Bagshaw and Norton (1994) which held that all that is required for an authority to **make** an Order is that it is reasonable to allege a right of way subsists, based on there being no incontrovertible evidence that the claimed route could not subsist (Test B). Generally speaking the historic documents up to and including 1885 (the Portland Estate Plan) when considered together suggest that the claimed route A-B-C was a public carriage road. Although the documents which post-date 1885 do not show the route to be public highway, there is no evidence of pre-existing highway rights being stopped up therefore it is reasonable to allege that such rights continue to exist.*

- The Commission would object to the making of a Modification Order at Restricted Byway status, but if the Committee concludes that an Order should be made, we would encourage the Committee to consider the route be recorded as a public bridleway subject to the Council agreeing to install suitable barriers to prevent illegal access.

None of the evidence suggests that the route was a public bridleway. For example, the Edwinstowe Inclosure Award (1821) refers to the route as being the 'Clipstone Bilsthorpe and Southwell Road', the Clipstone Tithe Map (1824) refers to the route as being the 'Bilsthorpe Road', the Rufford Highway Surveyor's records refer to part of the route as being a public road maintained by the parish, while the Portland Estate Plan (1885) refers to the route as being the public road from Bilsthorpe. The Ellis, Greenwood and Sanderson Maps all show the route as a minor public road. The law requires that the County Council must base any decision to record a public right of way on the available evidence of status rather than any desire or preference and as such, the County Council is unable to comply with such a request.

- The Commission requests that the County Council considers applying to the Magistrates Court under the Highways Act 1980 (Section 116) to remove any restricted byway rights subject to the reservation of bridleway rights and we request that this be undertaken before any modification order takes effect.

Should the Committee decide that a Restricted Byway exists, it would be technically possible to apply to a Magistrates Court prior to a Modification Order being made. The Court may only authorise the stopping-up of rights which are considered unnecessary or it may consider whether the route could be diverted to make it more commodious to the public. However, it would be difficult to justify an application before the route is made available again to the public as it would not then be possible to demonstrate whether or not non-motorised vehicular use was actually taking place and therefore whether the rights for non-mechanically propelled vehicles were necessary. If the claimed route was recorded as a restricted byway, and there followed a period of time to allow the public to exercise such rights, a survey and consultation exercise could then be carried out to establish the level of non-motorised vehicular use. This would clarify whether the removal of restricted byway rights was appropriate. If such use were found to be negligible or none, an application could then be made on the grounds that a restricted byway was unnecessary. It is not possible however, to pre-judge this matter.

- The Forestry Commission is exempt from the provisions of the Highways Act 1980 due to Crown exemption. Any references to the Highways Act relate only in so far as the Act affects the County Council.

This is noted. Furthermore, this Modification Order Application is not affected by matters of Crown immunity.

Reason/s for Recommendation/s

34. When considered in its totality, the evidence suggests that until 1885 the claimed route A-B-C was a minor public road. The evidence is particularly persuasive in respect of the Edwinstowe Inclosure Award of 1821, the Clipstone Tithe Maps of 1824 and 1844, the Rufford Highway Surveyors records of 1882-3 and the Portland Estate Plan of 1885. Such evidence is reinforced by the depiction of the route as an 'open road' or cross road' in the Ellis (1831), Greenwood (1831) and Sanderson (1835) maps. This outweighs evidence to the contrary found in the Chapman Map of 1774, the 1910 Finance Act documents (which show the route but not public rights), the Highway Authority 'Handover Maps' of 1929 and the Parish Schedules of 1954. A possible explanation for this conflict of evidence is that (for reasons unknown) the route ceased to be maintained by Southwell Urban District Council after 1894, and when in 1929 responsibility for the minor public roads was transferred to the County Council, the failure to record the route as a public highway in the handover maps perpetuated the view that the road was solely in private ownership. Nevertheless, the earlier documentary evidence suggests that public highway rights did exist on the claimed route and that these rights were not subsequently extinguished.
35. The Application relates to the addition of a public bridleway along the route being claimed. The discovered evidence suggests that the route was a carriage road rather than a public bridleway. No evidence has been discovered to suggest that the route has ever been merely a public bridleway.
36. It would only be proper for the Council not to make an Order if the evidence against the route established incontrovertibly that a public right of way could not exist.
37. Any rights for mechanically propelled vehicles on the claimed route were extinguished on 2nd May 2006 by virtue of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 (Section 67).
38. Matters referred to by the Forestry Commission such as Gating Orders and the stopping up of highway rights at a Magistrates Court, could be considered as part of the County Council's usual management of rights of way following a Modification Order being confirmed, but such matters are not legally relevant to whether or not a public highway exists.

Statutory and Policy Implications

39. This report has been compiled after consideration of implications in respect of finance, the public sector equality duty, human resources, crime and disorder, human rights, the safeguarding of children, sustainability and the environment and those using the service and where such implications are material they are described below. Appropriate consultation has been undertaken and advice sought on these issues as required.

RECOMMENDATION/S

1. It is RECOMMENDED that Committee accept the application and approve the making of a Modification Order to add a restricted byway (rather than a bridleway) to the Definitive Map and Statement on the basis that, for the reasons set out above, it is considered by the Authority a public right of way is reasonably alleged to subsist.

Eddie Brennan
Definitive Map Officer

For any enquiries about this report please contact:
Eddie Brennan (0115 9774709)
Definitive Map Officer

Constitutional Comments [SJE - 24/06/2013]

This decision falls within the terms of reference of the Rights of Way Committee to whom the exercise of the Authority's powers relating to public rights of way has been delegated.

Financial Comments [SEM - 24/06/13]

There are no specific financial implications arising directly from this report.

Background Papers

Except for previously published documents, which will be available elsewhere, the documents listed here will be available for inspection in accordance with Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972.

Modification Order Application case file

Electoral Division(s) and Member(s) Affected

Rufford Councillor John Peck

ROW96 25 July 2013